

REMARKS

Claims 1 through 14 are pending in this application. Claims 1-3, 6, 8, 9, and 11-14 have been allowed. Claims 4, 5, 7 and 10 have been rejected under section 112. In response, claims 4, 5, 7 and 10 have been amended to overcome the section 112 rejections.

Claims 4 & 5

The Examiner rejected claims 4 and 5 because it was unclear whether the “motor” is the same as the motor assembly recited in claim 1. Claims 4 and 5 have been amended to depend from claim 2, thereby providing an antecedent basis for the “motor”, and clarifying that it is not the same as the “motor assembly” recited in claim 1. This was apparently a typographical error in the dependency reference.

Claim 7, first rejection

The Examiner rejected claim 7, because the phrase “the two guiding rods” lacked antecedent basis. In response, the phrase “a plurality of guiding rods located on each side of the center rod” has been replaced with the phrase “two guiding rods” thereby providing the necessary antecedent basis.

Claim 7, second rejection

The Examiner also rejected claim 7, because it was unclear whether the “spring” (second instance) is the same as the spring (first instance) recited in claim 7, or the spring hinge recited in claim 6 (the Examiner referenced claim 8, but “spring hinge” only appears in claim 6). In response, the adjective “bias” has been added to the “spring” in

claim 7 (both instances), to clarify that the bias spring in claim 7 is not the same as the spring hinge in claim 6.

In order to better point out and distinctly claim the bias spring, claim 7 was also amended to refer to the frame as the “bracket frame”, the “center rod” was changed to the “center tube coupled to the bracket frame”, and the bias spring is claimed as located coaxially around the “inner rod of the center tube”. This amendment is consistent with Figure 5 and the Detailed Description (p. 6, ll.6-12), wherein one embodiment is shown with bracket frame 68, center tube 72, inner rod 74, and bias spring 76.

Claim 10

The Examiner rejected claim 10, because it was unclear whether the “frame” is the same as the frame recited in claim 1. In response, the adjective “actuator” has been added to the “frame” in claim 10, to clarify that the actuator frame in claim 10 is not the same as the frame in claim 1, and to better point out and distinctly claim the actuator frame.

CONCLUSION

No new matter has been added by these amendments, and entry of these amendments is therefore respectfully requested. Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner’s determination that claims 4, 5, 7, and 10 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under section 112. As dependent claims, these claims include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In view of the

amendments made herein, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejected claims.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are now allowable. If there remain any issues in this case which can be addressed by telephone, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Please charge any fees associated with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 19-2090.

Respectfully submitted,
SHELDON & MAK PC

Date: 1/20/05

By: Robert J. Rose
Robert J. Rose
Reg. No. 47,037

SHELDON & MAK PC
225 South Lake Avenue, 9th Floor
Pasadena, California 91101-3021
Telephone 626-796-4000
Facsimile 626-795-6321

Customer No. 23676